

## REMARKS

Claims 1-35 are pending in the application. Claim 31-35 are new. Support for the newly added claimed may be found through the specification and drawings, such as at page 10, lines 15-23 of the specification.

### *Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102(e)*

The Examiner indicated that Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Darbee et al., U.S. Patent Number 6,130,726 (Darbee). The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Regarding Claims 1, 8 and 14, the Claims include the limitation of “determines whether event related program guide data is available in the second information handling system, and, in the even the event related program guide data is not available, the second information handling system sends a request for the program guide data to the first information handling system.” The Examiner, in the *Advisory Action*, asserts “once a user identification is entered/established, the remote software application, acknowledges a new user, thus, also acknowledges that program data/advertising information are not stored in the remote, since the remote only stores subsets of available program guide and/or advertising information, and thereby transmits to set-top box/TV/host the new user identification, and subsequently is able to filter/selectively retrieve the downloaded information.” *Advisory Action*. This is not the case.

Assuming for the sake of argument that the Examiner’s assertion is true, through utilization of the present invention, if a new user were to utilize a remote and the information required was located in the remote, the remote would not need to access the set-top box as in Darbee. In Darbee, as stated by the Examiner, “selective download occurs upon the identification of the remote control unit itself, an identification of the user of the remote control or upon some assessment of the viewing habits or preferences of the user” and not upon determination if the event related program data is located in the system itself. Thus, the Darbee reference does not disclose, teach or suggest “determines whether event related program guide data is available” and “in the event that related program guide data is not available, the second information handling system sends a request” as claimed.

In another example of the Darbee invention, suppose for the sake of argument that a second identified user in Darbee required the same information in the remote control as a first previously identified user, and thus, the information was already in the remote. The Darbee reference would still try to obtain the information from the set-top box regardless of the data stored in the remote. However, through use of the present invention, if the information was available in an information handling system, the information handling system would not need to query a set-top box and download the information again as in Darbee.

Regarding Claim 27, the Examiner in the *Advisory Action* asserted that "since Darbee discloses in the background, that EPG's are normally displayed on the screen of a television set or set-top box, with the guide data either replace or overlaying the program the user is watching (col. 1, line 29-39)." This is not the present invention. As claimed in Claim 27, a first display and a second display are claimed, "event related program guide data on said second display corresponds to said electronic program guide data displayed on said first display of said first information handling system." Thus, the claim discloses information on a first information handling system and a second information handling system, and not a single display as asserted by an Examiner. In other words, while the present invention may overlay a guide and content in a display as claimed in Claim 28, the limitation of Claim 27 pertains to a first display and a second display and the information displayed thereon.

Regarding Claims 31-35, the Claims pertain to a method of displaying data on a first information handling system and a second information handling system, which is not disclosed, taught or suggested by the references.

Therefore, it is believed that the claims are allowable, and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In light of the forgoing, reconsideration and allowance of the claims is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,  
Gateway, Inc.

Dated: October 15, 2002

By:

  
William J. Breen, III  
Reg. No. 45,313

William J. Breen, III  
SUITER & ASSOCIATES PC  
14301 FNB Parkway, Suite 220  
Omaha, NE 68154  
(402) 496-0300      telephone  
(402) 496-0333      facsimile